



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/638,654	08/14/2000	Roger William Gutwein	7718M	9656

27752 7590 04/24/2002

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION
WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE
CINCINNATI, OH 45224

EXAMINER

WEIER, ANTHONY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1761	7

DATE MAILED: 04/24/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/638,654

Applicant(s)

GUTWEIN ET AL.

Examiner

Anthony Weier

Art Unit

1761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/22/02
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-7 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1761

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group II in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the groups have not acquired a separate status in the art, and that prosecution of all groups together would eliminate duplication of search efforts. This is not found persuasive because the groups are patentably distinct and are required by statute to be examined separately. There can be examined no more than one invention per application.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

3. Claims 8-33 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-26 of copending Application No. 09/638567. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

4. Claims 8-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 8-13, the use of the terminology "a minimum period of about..." and "a maximum period of about..." is confusing because it is not clear whether a range is being claimed or a specific time period. Also, "the onset of brewing" and "the coffee extract" lack antecedent basis. It is not clear as well whether the delay time is intended to begin once brewing

Art Unit: 1761

begins or at some period after brewing begins. If it is the latter, then the scope of the instant claims cannot be determined since time after brewing begins could be any time (e.g. 5 minute minimum period plus time from onset of brewing to the beining of this "minimum" period).

In claims 14-17, "the extraction portion" lacks antecedent basis.

In claims 18 and 19, "the cofee/water dilution ratios" (misspelling as well in claim 18) lack antecedent basis.

Claims 14-17 are confusing because they refer to roast and ground coffee, but this is not specified in other claims.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by EP 893065.

EP 893065 discloses preparation of a concentrated coffee extract this packaged and diluted at a later time, for example, as late as 16 weeks (i.e. the shelf life of the extract).

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11-19, 24-26, and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 893065.

EP 893065 discloses a brew solids of greater than 55% which reads on instant claims 14-16.

The claims differ in that they refer to a maximum time in waiting prior to dilution. EP 893065 is silent concerning times other than 5 weeks and 16 weeks which are related to the shelf-life of the coffee extract. Absent a showing of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have diluted said extract with the ratio called for as a matter of choice depending on the strength of the coffee desired, amount of coffee desired, etc.

EP 893065 is silent regarding the dilution ratio in the product. However, such determination would have been well within the purview of a skilled artisan, and, absent a showing of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to have attained such dilution ratios as a matter of choice through routine experimental optimization depending on the strength of the brew extract and the consumer's particular tastes regarding coffee.

7. Claims 8-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kalenian.

Kalenian discloses preparation of a coffee extract followed by diluting same at some point later. The claims differ in that they recite the particular time before diluting. Absent a showing of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have employed the particular times as called as a matter of choice depending transportation required for completing the dilution step (e.g. extract prepared in one facility and diluted elsewhere).

The claims also differ with regard to the amount of solids in the brew extract as well as the dilution ratio of the final product. However, such determinations are well within the purview

Art Unit: 1761

of one having ordinary skill in the art, and, absent a showing of unexpected results, it would have been further obvious to have attained such values as a matter of choice through routine experimental optimization depending on the particular strength/taste desired in the final product, the amount of coffee, etc.


8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Weier whose telephone number is 703-308-3846. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 703-308-3959. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3602 for regular communications and 703-305-3602 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0651.

Anthony Weier
April 21, 2002

ANTHONY J. WEIER
PRIMARY EXAMINER


4/21/02